DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 210 SP 016 825

AUTHOR	Hood, Paul D.; Blackwell, Laird R.
TITLE	The Role of Teachers and Other School Practitioners in Decision Making and Innovation. Educational Dissemination Studies Program.
INSTITUTION	Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Aug 80
CONTRACT	400-80-0103
NOTE	43p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Role; *Curriculum Development; *Decision Making; *Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Improvement; *Instructional Innovation; Principals; School District Spending; Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Influence; *Teacher Participation; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

Three major studies of the role of teachers and other school district professionals in educational decision making and in initiating innovations, spanning the 1968-1973 time period, are reviewed and compared. A probable increase in the role of teachers as initiators of innovations is evident. Data on teachers and others as innovation initiators are shown to vary by: (1) the job position of the informant; (2) the size of the district; (3) the wealth of the district; (4) the grade level of the school; and (5) the level of professionalism of the instructional staff. Teacher participation in educational decision making is most evident in curriculum and instruction, but it is usually confined to advisory or collaborative roles except for areas under the teacher's direct control, such as methods of instruction and scheduling. There is evidence that school district size and wealth, and teacher professionalism, as well as the school's organizational structure affect levels and kinds of teacher participation. It is suggested that it may be a minority of teachers who are repeatedly involved in the initiation of educational innovations, and that major innovations tend to be initiated by and decided on by administrators. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED193210

Educational Dissemination Studies Program

THE ROLE OF TEACHERS AND OTHER SCHOOL PRACTITIONERS IN DECISION MAKING AND INNOVATION

Paul D. Hood
Laird R. Blackwell

August 1980

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FAR WEST LABORATORY
FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
1855 FOLSOM STREET · SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103

SP 016 825

THE ROLE OF TEACHERS AND OTHER SCHOOL PRACTITIONERS IN DECISION MAKING AND INNOVATION

Paul D. Hood

Laird R. Blackwell

August 1980

Educational Dissemination Studies Program

FAR WEST LABORATORY FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

OCT 2 8 1980

This project has been supported with federal funds from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under Contract No. 400-80-0103. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the National Institute of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government or the Far West Laboratory.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES..... v

ABSTRACT.....vii

INTRODUCTION..... 1

REANALYSIS OF THE FAR WEST LABORATORY
BAY AREA FIELD SURVEY OF DECISION
PROCESS IN EDUCATION (1968)..... 3

REVIEW OF MORE RECENT STUDIES ON THE
TEACHER ROLE IN EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS..... 13

The Stanford R&D Center Study..... 13
The Daft and Becker Study..... 16
The Fullan Synthesis..... 17

COMPARISON OF THE STUDIES..... 19

The Effect of Other Variables..... 25

SUMMARY..... 34

REFERENCES..... 39

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: ORIGINATOR OF INNOVATIONS BY ROLE..... 5

TABLE 2: INITIATION OF INNOVATIONS:
ROLE BY SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT..... 9

TABLE 3: INITIATION OF INNOVATIONS:
ROLE BY WEALTH OF SCHOOL DISTRICT..... 10

TABLE 4: PRINCIPALS' VIEWS OF THE WAYS IN WHICH CURRICULUM
DECISIONS ARE MADE..... 14

TABLE 5: DISTRIBUTION OF CHANGE INITIATORS
IN THE 112 CASE STUDIES..... 14

TABLE 6: PERCENTAGE INNOVATIONS PROPOSED BY TEACHERS OF
THIRTEEN SUBURBAN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS,
HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1968-1972..... 16

TABLE 7: FAR WEST SURVEY (1968)
TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF ORIGINATOR OF
INNOVATIONS BY ROLE..... 24

TABLE 8: TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM AND WHERE INITIATED..... 29

TABLE 9: FAR WEST SURVEY (1968)
ORIGINATOR OF INNOVATIONS BY ROLE AS REPORTED BY
B.A.-LEVEL AND M.A.-LEVEL TEACHERS..... 31

ABSTRACT

Three major studies of the role of teachers and other school district professionals in educational decision making and in initiating innovations, spanning the 1968-1973 time period, are reviewed and compared. After reconciling differences among the studies, the evidence points toward a probable increase in the role of teachers as initiators of innovations. Data on teachers and others as innovation initiators are shown to vary by: the job position of the informant, the size of the district; the wealth of the district, the grade level of the school, and the level of professionalism of the instructional staff.

Participation of teachers in educational decision making is wide spread, especially with respect to curriculum and instruction (e.g., only 17 percent of a random sample of teachers in one study indicated that they have had no involvement in curriculum decisions), but teacher involvement is usually confined to advisory or collaborative roles except for areas under the teachers' direct control (e.g., determining method of instruction or schedule in the teacher's own room). Again, there is evidence that school district size, wealth, and teacher professionalism as well as school organizational structure affect levels and kinds of teacher participation. However, qualitative data (provided primarily by one study) suggests that it may be a minority of teachers who are repeatedly involved in curriculum decisions and in the initiation of educational innovations, and that teacher-initiated innovations tend to be of less importance (e.g., use of a supplementary text), while major innovations tend to be initiated and decided on by administrators.

INTRODUCTION

With the trend in recent years toward educational decentralization and more school level planning and decision making, there has been considerable talk and sentiment for increased teacher participation in decision making about educational policy and practice. The traditional "top-down" method of decision making in which administrators (either at the district level or at the school level) make most educational decisions, even those involving classroom practice, has been strongly criticized by many. Teachers' organizations have contributed to this trend by exerting pressure for more teacher influence and control over the conduct and content of their classrooms. Such sentiments as "the most effective ideas originate from the people who are going to implement them" have been voiced by many teachers and administrators alike. Despite these apparent trends toward more teacher involvement in curriculum and teaching decisions and in the initiation of educational innovation, there have been few studies presenting data on the actual extent of such teacher involvement.

The primary purpose of this paper is to review and compare two major studies of San Francisco Bay Area school districts; one conducted in 1968 and the second in 1973. Additional data based on suburban high schools in the Chicago, Illinois area circa 1968-1972 will also be examined. The consistencies and inconsistencies among these studies will be analyzed for their implications as to the innovation process in education, with particular emphasis on teacher involvement in this process vis a vis the roles played by others in the school district.

REANALYSIS OF THE FAR WEST LABORATORY BAY AREA FIELD SURVEY OF DECISION PROCESS IN EDUCATION (1968)

One of the thrusts of the 1968 Far West Laboratory field survey, Decision Processes and Information Needs in Education (Chorness, Rittenhouse, and Heald, 1968) was to gather information on the extent of participation in educational decision-making by the various roles involved. Superintendents, district level staff, principals, and teachers from 63 school districts in three San Francisco Bay Area counties were questioned as to their and others' roles in educational decision making and in the initiation of educational innovation. Because the data on source of innovation from this study is differentiated by specific role of both the informant and the identified originator of each of 16 innovations, and by type of innovation, it has the potential for adding considerably to the data-based knowledge about the process of educational innovation in the schools. Because this data is from a 1968 study, it is possible to compare this study to the more recent studies reviewed later to document changes in relative influence on the innovation process by different education roles. Since this data is differentiated by the role of the informant, it is also possible to contrast the perceptions about the innovation process of people in the various roles.

According to Meyer, et al. (1978) and others, the organizational structure of a school system is highly segmented and decentralized and is internally inconsistent. In a study of the perceptions of school educators in the San Francisco Bay Area of their school policies and practices, Meyer found very little agreement between the district staff, principals, and teachers about what policies or practices their school district, or even

their particular school, employed. It might be expected, then, that the Far West Laboratory (FWL) data (1968) would also show little agreement between roles as to who was the originator of various innovations.*

Reanalysis of the FWL data showed the following:

1. Among the six types of positions most frequently mentioned as originators of innovations, teachers are identified more frequently than persons in any other position. "Total across informants and types," the fifth data row in Table 1, shows the teachers initiating 26 percent of all innovations, principals initiating 20 percent, and other positions from 12 to 16 percent). However, there are several strong qualifications to this finding.

2. As Meyer, et al. suggested, the role of the perceiver makes a considerable difference in the data (see the first four data rows in Table 1).

   a. According to superintendents (and assistant superintendents), teachers and district staff are the major sources of innovation and are about equal in frequency of initiation.

   b. According to principals, principals and teachers are the major sources of innovation and are equal in frequency of initiation.

   c. According to district staff, the assistant superinten dent for instruction initiates most innovations, while district staff (educational specialists or consultants at the district level), teachers, and assistant superintendents for curriculum are about equal in the frequency of initiation.

   d. However, according to teachers, teachers are the major initiators. So, although everyone perceives teachers as having a strong role in initiating innovations, only teachers themselves perceive teachers as initiating more innovations than anyone else.

---

* The questionnaire item was worded as follows: "Which of the following [list of 16 innovations] have you seen adopted in your district? With whom and from what source did the idea originate?" Informants were asked to select from two lists the primary originator within the district and also the the primary external source, if one existed. In this analysis we focus on the responses regarding the originator within the district.

TABLE 1

ORIGINATOR OF INNOVATIONS BY ROLE

INFORMANT	ORIGINATOR											
	SUPT.		ASST.SUPT. INSTRUCTION		ASST.SUPT. CURRICULUM		DISTRICT STAFF		PRINCIPAL		TEACHER	
TOTAL FOR ALL 16 INNOVATIONS												
Superintendent	43	16%	25	9%	25	9%	60	22%	49	18%	67	25%
Principal	63	11%	80	13%	62	10%	73	12%	161	27%	160	27%
District Staff	19	7%	59	23%	47	18%	50	19%	35	14%	48	19%
Teacher	108	17%	51	8%	81	13%	94	15%	101	16%	188	30%
Total across informants & types	233	13%	215	12%	215	12%	277	16%	346	20%	463	26%
THREE CURRICULUM INNOVATIONS												
Superintendent	2	3%	6	10%	11	17%	18	29%	4	6%	22	35%
Principal	19	12%	27	17%	27	17%	21	13%	15	10%	47	30%
District Staff	0	0%	17	30%	8	14%	15	26%	1	2%	16	28%
Teacher	39	23%	15	9%	30	18%	28	17%	7	4%	47	28%
Total across informants	60	14%	65	15%	76	17%	82	19%	27	6%	132	30%
SIX TEACHING METHOD INNOVATIONS												
Superintendent	15	16%	9	10%	8	9%	20	21%	16	17%	26	28%
Principal	15	8%	19	10%	16	8%	33	17%	54	27%	62	31%
District Staff	7	8%	16	18%	21	23%	26	29%	6	7%	15	16%
Teacher	19	9%	16	8%	28	14%	32	16%	33	16%	74	37%
Total across informants	56	10%	60	10%	73	12%	111	19%	109	19%	177	30%
SEVEN ORGANIZATIONAL INNOVATIONS												
Superintendent	26	23%	10	9%	6	5%	22	20%	29	26%	19	17%
Principal	29	12%	34	14%	19	8%	19	8%	92	38%	51	21%
District Staff	12	11%	26	24%	18	16%	9	8%	28	25%	17	15%
Teacher	50	20%	20	8%	23	9%	34	13%	61	24%	67	26%
Total across informants	117	16%	90	12%	66	9%	84	12%	210	29%	154	21%

3. The type of innovation involved makes a considerable difference in who is likely to initiate it. (See the three blocks of data in Table 1 labelled "Curriculum Innovations," "Teaching Method Innovations," and "Organizational Innovations.")

   a. "Organizational" innovations which do not directly involve curriculum content or teaching methods (i.e., flexible scheduling, team-teaching, non-graded instruction, use of teacher aides, cultural enrichment, workstudy programs, student exchange programs) are perceived to be initiated primarily by principals. (See the last block of data in Table 1.) Teachers identify teachers (26%) about as often as they identify principals (24%) as originators of organizational innovations, but everyone else sees principals as more frequent initiators.

   b. "Curriculum" innovations (i.e., "new" sciences, "new" math, "new" social studies) are perceived by every type of informant to be initiated most frequently by teachers with district staff usually next in frequency of nomination.

   c. Innovations involving teaching methods (i.e., individualized instruction, programmed learning, language laboratory, computer-aided instruction, simulation or gaming, TV instruction) are also perceived by all but district staff to be initiated most frequently by teachers, with district staff and principals next in frequency of identification as the primary originator.

4. Examination of the data for the different types of innovations by informants in different roles shows considerable similarities of perceptions among the various roles, but also reveals some striking differences as well.

   a. In general (total for all 16 innovations), the perceptions of teachers and superintendents tend to be most similar to each other and different from those of principals and district staff. The correspondence between teachers' and superintendents' perceptions is greatest for organizational innovations and least for curriculum innovations.

   b. Teachers perceive the role of teachers in initiating innovations as greater than that perceived by superintendents, principals, and district staff; except for "curriculum innovations" where the percentage of superintendents, principals, and district staff nominating teachers (35%, 30%, and 28% respectively) exceeds or equals the percentage of teachers nominating teachers (28%).

c. Principals consistently perceive the role of principals to be much greater for all types of innovations than others (superintendents, district staff, teachers) perceive it.

d. District staff (i.e., specialists and consultants) generally perceive the role of assistant superintendents (for instruction and for curriculum) in initiating innovations to be much more considerable that do all other respondents.

e. Superintendents and district staff perceive the role of other district staff to be much greater than do principals or teachers see the role of other district staff.

5. When some of the individual roles are combined so that innovation-initiation by teachers and by principals are compared to the sum of all district level personnel (i.e., superintendents, assistant superintendents, specialists, and consultants), the results look considerably different and contrast sharply with the findings of Daft and Becker and Schaffarzick to be considered later.

   a. When averaged over all respondents and over all types of innovations (see row titled "Total across informants and types" in Table 1), only 26 percent of innovations are perceived to be initiated by teachers, 20% percent by principals, and 53 percent by personnel at the district level. (13 percent by Superintendent, 12% by Assistant Superintendent, 12% by Assistant Superintendent Curriculum, and 16% by other district staff.)*

   b. For "organizational innovations," principals initiate more than do teachers (29% to 21%), but district level personnel still initiate the most (49%).

   c. For instructional innovations (both those involving "curriculum innovations" and those involving "teaching method innovations"), teachers are identified as originators more than principals (30% to 6%, and 30% to 19%, respectively); but even for these instructional innovations, district level personnel are perceived to have a much stronger role in initiation than teachers.

   d. Principals emphasize their own role in initiating innovations and downplay the role of district level personnel, while district staff emphasize the role of district level people and downplay the role of principals.

---

* Percentages across roles may not total exactly 100% due to rounding.

e. Disagreement between raters is most prominent with perceptions of who initiates teaching method innovations. Principals perceive somewhat equal roles in initiation for district level personnel, i.e., superintendents, assistant superintendents, district staff, (combined 42%), teachers (31%), and principals (27%); whereas district staff perceive that district level personnel initiate over three-fourths of those innovations, teachers 16%, and principals only 7%.

6. Data on average daily attendance (ADA) and cost per ADA was available in the FWL study, so it was possible to derive information from this study involving the initiation of innovation as related to size and wealth of the school district which could be compared to the findings of Schaffarzick (1976) and of Daft and Becker (1978). The latter study found that in school districts with a high percentage of highly professional teachers (i.e., teachers with advanced degrees), teacher initiation of innovations was considerably higher than in schools with a lower percentage of such teachers. Schaffarzick found that teacher initiation of innovations and participation in curriculum decision-making were higher in smaller school districts and in wealthier school districts (presumably, at least partly, because such districts could afford to hire more professional teachers).

   Reanalysis of the FWL data showed the following:

   a. As rated by all respondents, there is a tendency for smaller districts (i.e., those with lower ADA) to have more teacher initiation of innovations (see Table 2). However, in very large districts, district level personnel are responsible for a very high percent of innovations, while teachers account for very few. These findings hold for all the types of innovations included in this study, although they are most pronounced for curriculum innovations.

   b. As rated by all respondents, there is a marked tendency for wealthy districts (i.e., those with highest costs for ADA) to have more teacher initiation of innovations (see Table 3). Although the percent of teacher initiation for the poorest districts and those of moderate wealth are quite similar, there is a considerably higher percent of teacher initiation (over 50%) in the wealthiest districts. This finding of higher teacher participation in the wealthiest districts is consistent for all the types of innovations included in this study.

TABLE 2

INITIATION OF INNOVATIONS: ROLE BY SIZE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT

SIZE OF DISTRICT*	TEACHER		PRINCIPAL		DISTRICT PERSONNEL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
TOTAL FOR ALL INNOVATIONS						
1. (Smallest)	95	27%	80	22%	182	51%
2.	130	27%	118	25%	228	48%
3.	199	34%	102	17%	290	49%
4. (Largest)	53	16%	51	15%	235	69%
CURRICULUM INNOVATIONS						
1. (Smallest)	25	26%	14	14%	59	60%
2.	36	31%	6	5%	73	63%
3.	63	42%	5	3%	81	54%
4. (Largest)	10	12%	2	2%	71	86%
TEACHING METHOD INNOVATIONS						
1. (Smallest)	29	28%	21	20%	54	52%
2.	43	26%	39	24%	83	50%
3.	75	39%	31	16%	86	45%
4. (Largest)	23	20%	18	15%	76	65%
ORGANIZATIONAL INNOVATIONS						
1. (Smallest)	41	26%	45	29%	69	45%
2.	51	26%	73	37%	72	37%
3.	61	24%	66	26%	123	49%
4. (Largest)	20	14%	31	22%	88	63%

1. (Smallest) ADA < 2,800
2. ADA = 2,800 - 5,199
3. ADA = 5,200 - 11,149 (1968)
4. (Largest) ADA = 11,150 or higher

TABLE 3

INITIATION OF INNOVATIONS: ROLE BY WEALTH OF SCHOOL DISTRICT

WEALTH OF DISTRICT*	TEACHER		PRINCIPAL		DISTRICT PERSONNEL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
TOTAL FOR ALL INNOVATIONS						
1. (Poorest)	126	24%	113	22%	278	54%
2.	109	27%	102	26%	188	47%
3.	131	21%	97	15%	398	64%
4. (Wealthiest)	105	53%	32	16%	61	31%
CURRICULUM INNOVATIONS						
1. (Poorest)	28	21%	10	8%	95	71%
2.	40	41%	3	3%	55	56%
3.	30	18%	11	7%	125	75%
4. (Wealthiest)	35	80%	4	9%	5	11%
TEACHING METHOD INNOVATIONS						
1. (Poorest)	51	31%	30	18%	84	51%
2.	40	28%	39	27%	65	45%
3.	58	27%	32	15%	124	58%
4. (Wealthiest)	33	52%	5	8%	25	40%
ORGANIZATIONAL INNOVATIONS						
1. (Poorest)	47	21%	73	33%	99	45%
2.	29	16%	60	38%	68	43%
3.	43	17%	54	22%	149	61%
4. (Wealthiest)	37	41%	23	25%	31	34%

* Cost per ADA 1 = < $550; 2 = $550 - 619; 3 = $620 - 749; 4 = $750 + (1968)

7. The Far West report presents data on self-perceived involvement for all four positions (superintendents, district staff, principals, and teachers) in 24 areas of educational planning. (Chorness, Rittenhouse, and Heald, 1968, pp. 74-76). The patterns of level of involvement for the four categories of school personnel are quite different. Superintendents and principals show the highest average levels of involvement in all but two areas, while teachers are lowest of the four groups in all but the same two areas (determining the schedule in the teachers own room, and determining method of instruction within classroom). The district staff members' pattern is most similar to that of the superintendents whom they advise. Superintendents and staff are most concerned with long range planning about the district as a whole, while principals and teachers are most heavily involved in planning for school and classroom functions. Curriculum planning is a function for all levels.

   On a scale of four levels of involvement (1 = have had no involvement, 2 = have provided advice when asked, 3 = have served with formal groups or committees which have submitted recommendations, 4 = have been given formal authority to make decisions or develop policy), teachers average above 3.0 (formal advisory group involvement) in two of the 24 areas: determining methods of instruction in the classroom (average 3.40) and determining the schedule in the teachers own room (3.26). However, in nine other areas teachers averaged between 3.0 (formal advisory group) and 2.0 (provided advice when asked): selection of instructional supplies (2.77), grouping, promotion, grade-reporting practices (2.53), curriculum planning and development (2.44), organization and content of the curriculum (2.42), assignment of children to the various classes, sections, or teachers (2.27), building rules and regulations (2.17), establishing educational objectives (2.15), evaluating the educational program (2.12) and inservice education and teacher orientation (2.05). The majority of the teachers reported no involvement in seven areas dealing mainly with budgets, school plant expansion, and selection of new teachers. [curriculum areas underlined]

   While nearly all superintendents, district staff, and principals report that they have served on formal groups or committees which have made recommendations regarding curriculum planning and development or organization and content of the curriculum, slightly less than half (49%) of the teachers report this level of involvement in curriculum decision making; however, only 17 percent of the teachers report that they have had no involvement in decision making about curriculum.

REVIEW OF MORE RECENT STUDIES ON THE TEACHER ROLE IN EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS

The Stanford R&D Center Study

Beginning in the spring of 1973, the Environment for Teaching Program at the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching undertook a multi-year study of organization and instruction in elementary schools. (Cohen, et al., 1976; Johnson, 1976; Schaffarzick, 1976; Meyer, et al., 1978).*

Teachers, principals, and superintendents were interviewed regarding the roles and influence of various participants in curriculum decision making. Schaffarzick (1976) found the following:

1. Most principals said that teachers are deeply involved in decisions regarding curriculum. The majority of principals indicated that these decisions were made jointly (with equal participation) by teachers and principals (see Table 4). Of the respondents that said such decisions were not made jointly, most indicated that teachers, rather than principals or district level administrators, made these decisions. This was especially true for decisions involving the development of courses within a curriculum (33% of the principals said that teachers made these decisions, while only 11% said principals made them). In regards to making more major decisions about the adoption of an entire curriculum, the respondent principals were almost equally divided between attribution to teachers and to principals. The conclusion from these findings, then, would be that (according to principals) teachers have a (if not <u>the</u>) major role in curriculum decisions.

2. In data not differentiated by role of respondent but presumably based on principals' reports (see Table 5), it was indicated that teachers (individually or in groups) initiated more educational innovations (29%) than did people

---

* The Far West Laboratory study included elementary and high school staff in 63 school districts in three San Francisco Bay Area counties (Alameda, Santa Clara, and San Mateo). The Stanford R&D Center study sample included elementary schools in these same three counties plus elementary schools in Contra Costa, Marin, and San Francisco.

TABLE 4

PRINCIPALS' VIEWS OF THE WAYS IN WHICH CURRICULUM DECISIONS ARE MADE
(from Schaffarzick, 1976)

WAY IN WHICH DECISION IS MADE	# OF RESPONSES	% OF TOTAL
"Decision to adopt a new major reading curriculum"		
Basically at the district level	25	13
Basically by the principal	46	25
Basically by teachers	50	27
Shared equally between principal and teachers	62	33
No decision has been made	4	2
	187	100%
"Decision to develop a special course or unit not standard in curriculum"		
Basically at the district level	10	5
Basically by the principal	21	11
Basically by teachers	61	33
Shared equally between principal and teachers	89	48
No decision has been made	6	3
	187	100%

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF CHANGE INITIATORS IN THE 112 CASE STUDIES
(from Schaffarzick, 1976)

TYPE OF INITIATOR	# OF CHANGES SUGGESTED	% OF TOTAL
Groups of teachers	19	17
Groups of parents	16	14
State Department of Education	14	12
Individual teachers	14	12
Curriculum specialists	11	10
Other district administrators (excluding superintendents)	8	7
Superintendents	6	5
Principals	6	5
District-level committees	4	4
School boards	4	4
Publishers' sales representatives	3	3
Individual parents	2	2
Other community groups	2	2
District nurses	2	2
Groups of principals	1	1
	112	100%

of any other role. Principals (individually or in groups) initiated only 6% of the innovations discussed, while district level personnel (including curriculum specialists, superintendents, and other district administrators) initiated 26% of the innovations. Although these results are not broken down according to the role of the respondent, the conclusion from this data would be, again, that teachers have a (and probably the) major role in initiating local curriculum change.

3. Although no tabular data is presented, Schaffarzick notes that in most small school districts teachers have more participation in curriculum decisions and more involvement in initiating educational changes than in larger districts. His explanation for this finding is that the smaller central staffs typical of smaller districts find it easier to communicate with (and to receive input from) school personnel.

4. More "professional" teachers (i.e., those with higher degrees and/or specialized expertise) tend to be more involved in curriculum decisions and initiation of educational change. This finding is probably partly a function of what teachers feel competent and motivated to do and is partly due to what they are allowed to do by administrators.

5. In most wealthier school districts, teachers have more participation in curriculum decisions and more involvement in initating educatinal change than in poorer districts. Schaffarzick's explanation for this finding is that the wealthier districts are able to hire larger, more specialized, and more professional staffs, and can afford to give greater amounts of release time for staffs to spend in curriculum change considerations. It would seem reasonable to conclude from the data in this study that teachers do have a significant and powerful influence on decisions regarding curriculum. Apparently, in most cases, teachers alone or jointly with principals initiate ideas for educational innovation and decide about adoption of innovations.

However, these conclusions are tempered somewhat by the following conclusions based on some other data and observations.

6. The majority of teacher participation in curriculum decisions and in initiation of educational innovations is probably due to the repeated involvement of a very small minority of teachers.

7. There is reason to believe that most of the innovations initiated by teachers are of minor importance (e.g., use of a supplementary text), while major innovations are initiated and decided on by administrators.

8. The role of the teacher in curriculum decisions is often delimited and deprived of power by earlier decisions by administrators.

The Daft and Becker Study

In Daft and Becker's (1978) study of innovations adopted by 13 Cook County suburban high school districts, they found the following (see Table 6):

1. Most "educational" innovations (i.e., those involving curriculum content and teaching methods) are initiated by teachers.

2. Most "administrative" innovations (e.g., scheduling, budgets) are initiated by administrators.

3. "Highly professional" teachers (i.e., with advanced degrees) initiate more innovations than do less highly professional teachers.

4. In school districts with "high professionalism" (i.e., with a high percent of teachers having advanced degrees), teachers initiate almost all "educational" innovations and many "administrative" innovations.*

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE INNOVATIONS PROPOSED BY TEACHERS OF THIRTEEN SUBURBAN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS, HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1968-1972 (from Daft and Becker, 1978, p. 63)

All innovations	69
Innovations that benefit college-bound students	83
Innovations that benefit terminal students	55
Curriculum and teaching techniques	87
All other innovations (administrative, etc.)	26

* It appears that questionnaires mailed to superintendents and school board members are the sources for these data (Daft and Becker, pp. 33-34).

The conclusion from these findings obtained over the four-year period 1968-1972 is consistent with that from the Schaffarzick study: teachers have a strong role in educational decision-making and in initiation of educational innovations. According to Daft and Becker, teachers have the major role in initiating innovations involving curriculum and teaching. Although there is some evidence in Schaffarzick's study to support this, that author offers several provisos and caveats to such a strong conclusion.

The Fullan Synthesis

Fullan (1979) approaches the issue of educational innovation from the perspective of knowledge utilization rather than of adoption of new practices. He is considerably less optimistic about the role of teachers in educational change than are Daft and Becker or Schaffarzick. Based on a review of several studies, Fullan concludes that most teachers have neither the time nor motivation to contact or assimilate new knowledge about education and that such knowledge is rarely available in a systematic form usable by teachers. For these reasons, although emphasizing the lack of knowledge about the roles and relative influence of the various agents internal to the school district, Fullan tends to downplay the role of the teacher in educational decisions and in initiating innovation. He regards the high percentage of teacher-initiated innovations in the Daft and Becker study as surprising and suggests that their results may be somewhat misleading or at least atypical in that:

1. The majority of teacher-initiated innovations may be due to a small minority of teachers;

2. Teacher-initiation of innovations probably only occurs in districts or schools providing resource support and/or continuous peer interaction as an accepted process; and

3. Innovations initiated by teachers are usually narrow in scope and of minor significance.

These comments by Fullan are somewhat similar to those of Schaffarzick (see pp. 15-16).

COMPARISON OF THE STUDIES

Although dealing with similar issues, the Far West, Stanford, and Daft and Becker studies present some problems in making comparisons. The Daft and Becker study is based on data from thirteen suburban (Cook County, Illinois) high school districts, with data averaged over four school years 1968-69 to 1971-72. The Stanford R&D Center study presents data on 34 urban and suburban elementary school districts in six San Francisco Bay Area counties with data collected in Spring 1973. The Far West Laboratory survey presents data on urban and suburban, elementary and secondary districts in three San Francisco Bay Area counties with data collected in Spring 1968.* There are thus differences in dates of data collection, grade level of schools, and degree of urbanization. More importantly, the study designs are quite different. The Far West survey focused primarily on individuals in four types of positions, with small random samples of principals and teachers selected within school districts. Sixteen specific types of innovations and 24 specific decision situations are identified. The Daft and Becker study focused primarily on 13 districts and on 38 to 40 innovations as the units of analysis. The innovations are reported only by broad classes (e.g., curriculum and teaching techniques, innovations that benefit terminal students). The Stanford study focused on the organization of instruction in individual schools within districts (Cohen, et al., 1976, Meyer, et al., 1978) or specific curriculum innovations and instructional practices.

---

* Thirty-five of the 63 districts in the Far West survey were elementary school districts, 19 were unified, and 9 were high school level districts, consequently perhaps over three-fourths of the staff in this sample of districts were concerned with elementary level schools.

Despite these many differences there are some general commonalities in the study findings.

Participation in Decision Making. The Far West Laboratory survey (Chorness, Rittenhouse, and Heald, 1968, pp. 61-76) provides the most detailed data on levels of participation in decision making by providing information on self-reported levels of involvement for superintendents, district staff, and random samples of principals and teachers, with respect to 24 areas of educational planning. With the sole exception of two areas involving classroom level decisions (about classroom schedule and method of instruction in the classroom), teachers report lower, often significantly lower, levels of participation in decision making than do the three other groups. However, the majority of the teachers report at least having "provided advice when asked," if not higher levels of involvement, in 11 of the 24 areas of educational planning, and nearly half (49%) report this much involvement with respect to "organization and content of the curriculum" or "curriculum planning and development." These are self-reports by teachers. The Stanford study (Schaffarzick, 1976) depends on elementary school principals' reports of the way two curriculum decisions were made. The "decision to adopt a new major reading curriculum" was reported (by principals) to be made "basically by teachers" (27%) or "shared equally between principals and teachers" (33%). Although these data deal only with elementary school teachers, are five years more recent than the Far West survey, and rely on the principals report, the difference is between 49 percent (Far West survey) and 60 percent (Schaffarzick) in reported level of teacher involvement. Daft and Becker provide no data on participation in decision making.

Initiation of Innovations. All three studies provide data on this issue. The Far West survey and the Daft and Becker study are particularly informative since both indicate that the percentage of innovations that are proposed by teachers varies greatly according to the type of innovation. (The Stanford study focused exclusively on curriculum and instruction.) However, the Far West survey and the Daft and Becker study provide somewhat different findings. Daft and Becker, for instance, report that as high as 87 percent of the innovative curriculum and teaching techniques were proposed by [suburban high school] teachers, while only 26 percent of other kinds of innovations were proposed by teachers. The Far West Laboratory survey of Bay Area urban and suburban, elementary and high school staff, shows roughly comparable percentages of teachers as originators of "other" innovations (organizational innovations): teachers report that teachers originate 26 percent (exactly the same percentage as Daft and Becker), and averaged over the four types of informants, teachers are identified as originators for 21 percent of the "other" innovations. However, the Far West data show teachers as originators of curriculum innovations or teaching method innovations in only 30 percent of the cases, a stark contrast to the 87 percent reported by Daft and Becker. The Stanford data (see Table 5) show groups of elementary school teachers as change initiators for 17 percent of the innovations and individual teachers as initiators for 12 percent of the cases, for a total of 29 percent. The Far West and Stanford data seem to agree closely, but this is deceptive. The Far West survey asked separate questions about "primary originator within district" and "primary source [if any] external to district." Moreover, the percentages reported in Tables 1 and 2 are based on counts over only the six major school staff roles and do not

include school boards, students, community residents, etc. In Table 5 (Schaffarzick) we find that 71 of the 112 innovations were initiated by teachers, curriculum specialists, superintendents, district administrators, district nurses, principals, district committees, etc. Since 33 of these 71 innovations were initiated by individual teachers or groups of teachers, the Stanford (Schaffarzick) data yield an estimate that 46 percent of all school staff-originated innovations were initiated by teachers, as compared to the Far West survey figure of of 30 percent. Because the Far West and the Stanford survey both included urban and suburban schools, and the majority of the schools involved were elementary level, perhaps three-fourths in the Far West survey and all in the Stanford study, the data are somewhat comparable, but five years different in time. Cohen, et al. (1976) and Schaffarzick (1976) both make the point that, in the several years preceeding their 1973 study, the schools they studied had undergone significant changes that generally supported greater (but unmeasured change in) teacher participation. Hence the 30 percent to 46 percent difference between the 1968 Far West data and the 1973 Stanford data may, in part, reflect real changes in the proportion of times that teachers are identified as the originators of [curriculum] innovations. (But see page 23.)

The Daft and Becker data are markedly higher (69% for all innovations, 87% for curriculum and teaching). The fact that the Daft and Becker study is confined to suburban schools [in Cook County, Illinois], deals only with high schools, and relies (apparently) on questionnaires sent to superintendents and school board members, might explain some of the differences. However, the 69 percent figure still seemed to be extremely high. Consequently, we went back to a second (cross validation) sample from the Far West study and cross tabulated teacher school level (elementary school,

junior high school, senior high school) by teachers' perceptions of the primary originator of innovations within districts. The results are displayed in Table 7.*

In considering first the total for all 16 innovations, we see that senior high school teachers do, in fact, report substantially greater percentages of teachers as initiators (50%) as compared to junior high school teachers (39%) or elementary school teachers (32%). The results for the three curriculum types ("new" science, "new" math, and "new" social studies) are even more marked. Here the senior high school teachers report that 71 percent of the innovations were initiated by teachers. This percentage is nearly twice as high for junior high school teachers (36%); and over three times as high as for elementary teachers (21%). Although not quite as high, the same pattern is found for the six teaching method innovations and for the seven organizational innovations. We conclude that there appears to be a marked difference by school grade levels in terms of which types of persons tend to initiate innovations. Note that, at the elementary school level, the principal and the superintendent tend to play substantially more prominent roles than at the senior high school level. However, the role of district staff seems to vary by type of innovation and by level of school.

Although the percentages for teachers as initiators of innovations are not quite as high as those found by Daft and Becker, they make the Daft and Becker percentages seem more plausible.

---

* This time we included community and student roles in order to account for all within-district originators.

TABLE 7

FAR WEST SURVEY (1968)
TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF ORIGINATOR OF INNOVATIONS BY ROLE

INFORMANT	SCHOOL BOARD		SUPT.		DISTRICT STAFF		PRINCIPAL		TEACHER		COMMUNITY & STUDENTS	
TOTAL FOR 16 INNOVATIONS												
Elementary Teachers	18	7%	38	14%	64	23%	58	21%	88	32%	10	4%
Jr. High Teachers	9	8%	9	8%	29	27%	16	15%	41	39%	2	2%
Sr. High Teachers	5	5%	9	8%	27	25%	9	8%	54	50%	3	3%
TOTAL	32	7%	56	11%	120	25%	83	17%	183	37%	15	3%
THREE CURRICULUM INNOVATIONS												
Elementary Teachers	11	14%	15	19%	28	36%	7	9%	16	21%	0	0%
Jr. High Teachers	1	4%	5	20%	8	32%	1	4%	9	36%	1	4%
Sr. High Teachers	0	0%	1	5%	4	19%	1	5%	15	71%	0	0%
TOTAL	12	10%	21	17%	40	33%	9	7%	40	33%	1	1%
SIX TEACHING METHOD INNOVATIONS												
Elementary Teachers	1	1%	7	8%	26	30%	20	23%	31	35%	3	3%
Jr. High Teachers	5	15%	2	6%	10	30%	2	6%	14	42%	0	0%
Sr. High Teachers	3	8%	3	8%	10	26%	2	5%	19	50%	1	3%
TOTAL	9	6%	12	8%	46	29%	24	15%	64	40%	4	3%
SEVEN ORGANIZATIONAL INNOVATIONS												
Elementary Teachers	6	5%	16	14%	10	9%	31	28%	41	37%	7	6%
Jr. High Teachers	3	6%	2	4%	11	23%	13	27%	18	38%	1	2%
Sr. High Teachers	2	4%	5	10%	13	27%	6	13%	20	42%	2	4%
TOTAL	11	5%	23	11%	34	16%	50	24%	79	38%	10	5%

The Effect of Other Variables

A very large number of variables were included in each of the three studies; however, comparisons involving measures of participation or initiation of innovations with other variables can be made across two or more studies for only three variables: district size (student enrollment), district wealth (expenditures per pupil based on average daily attendance, ADA), and teacher professionalism (degree level attained by teachers).

District Size. Size is often a crucial variable in organizational analysis. So it is not surprising to find that it was considered in all three studies, but unfortunately not in ways that permit direct comparison. Schaffarzick (see item 3, p. 15) noted that, in small school districts, teachers have more participation in curriculum decisions and more involvement in initiating educational changes than in larger districts.*

The Far West study (see Table 2) provides partial corroboration for this conclusion, but with an emphasis on the other extreme. In the very largest districts (those with 11,150+ ADA), district personnel (all types) are by far the most frequent initiators of innovations (86% for curriculum; 65% for teaching method, and 63% for organizational innovations), while teachers in these very large districts are identified as initiators approximately half as frequently as teachers in all smaller size districts.

Although the Daft and Becker study considered school district size, it was reported only in relation to the measure of district innovations, and

---

* Johnson (1976, p. 49) reports a small but significant negative correlation between school size and teacher participation ($r = -.12$, $p < .05$). Principals in the Stanford study in smaller schools are more likely to report higher teacher participation, but not higher teacher influence.

not in terms of teacher participation or teacher role as initiators of innovation.*

Wealth. In the Stanford study, when teacher participation and influence were correlated with financial variables, the following pattern resulted:

> "Teachers' salaries are not correlated significantly with either teacher participation or teacher influence. The only financial variable showing a significant correlation with teacher influence is special district funding ($r = .18$, $p < .01$), a condition which suggests that the increased influence is brought about by greater interaction within the local school on some significant decisions involving a special project or activity."
>
> Several financial variables do have a positive relationship with teacher participation, as reported by the principals. The highest correlations are with expenditure on textbooks and supplementary materials ($r = .18$, $p < .01$). In general, principals in schools where money is spent (excluding salaries) report slightly greater teacher participation in decision making; but this is not translated into teacher influence on outcomes. The pattern that is suggested by these correlations is that principals ask for teacher preferences on the use of resources when resources are greater, but do not accord teachers a greater voice in final decisions on expenditures just on that basis. The greater voice in final decisions comes about only through professional interaction of a more intensive kind."
>
> (Johnson, 1976, pp. 49-50)

The Far West study data again tend to corroborate the Stanford study findings, but suggest that at least with respect to teachers as initiators of innovations (rather than as participants) the effect is most evident in

---

* Daft and Becker report non-significant positive correlations ($r = .28$ for the 1959-64 period; $r = .41$ for the 1968-72 period) between district size and adoption of innovations for college-bound students (p. 65), but a significant positive correlation between district size ($r = .54$, $p < .05$ for the 1968-72 period) and adoptions of innovations for terminal students (p. 85). They note that large school districts have a larger absolute number of terminal-oriented teachers and students which represents a greater need for terminal programs.

only the wealthier districts (dollars per average daily attendance), where teachers are twice as likely to be identified as the primary originators of innovations, as are teachers in less affluent districts.

Again the Daft and Becker study includes consideration of financial resources, but not in relation to teacher participation in decision making or as initiators of innovations.*

Teacher Professionalism. The Daft and Becker study makes a very strong case for the effect of teacher professionalism (defined as the percentage of district teaching staff who have completed a master's degree. Teacher professionalism correlated .65 ($p < .01$) with adoption of innovations for college-bound students, but -.31 (insignificant) with adoption of innovations for terminal students. They note:

> "Teacher professionalism (education) has a substantial positive association with the adoption of innovations for college-bound students. Highly educated teachers are knowledgeable about innovation and propose new ideas for adoption."
>
> (Daft and Becker, p. 80)

> "Teacher professionalism and affluence (educational expenditure per pupil) are unrelated to the adoption of innovations for terminal students. These variables are important to the adoption of innovations for college-bound students, but the adoption of innovations for terminal students is the result of a different process."
>
> (Daft and Becker, p. 95)

More to the point of the current analysis are two cross tabulations of degree of professionalism with where innovations are initiated. Table 8 indicates the percentage of innovations initiated by each of three sources--

---

* The Daft and Becker study shows that the presence of slack resources (percentage increase in education expenditure per pupil during the time period) is not significantly related to college-oriented innovations adopted ($r = -.18$) (p. 53), nor the number of terminal-oriented innovations adopted (-.05) (p. 85).

teachers, administrators (superintendents and principals), and collaborations--as well as the average number of adoptions per district ($\bar{x}$) per source, when districts are divided into categories according to the educational level (professionalism) of the teachers in the district, and innovations are divided into those that benefit college-bound students (Table 8a) and those that benefit terminal students (Table 8b). For college-oriented innovations (Table 8a), teachers (perhaps including other instructional support staff) initiate 94 percent of the innovations in districts with a high percentage of M.A.-level teachers, but only 58 percent in districts with low percentage of M.A.-level teachers. The proportion of innovations proposed by administrators (superintendents pius principals) alone and in collaboration with with teachers increases as teacher professionalism decreases. Note also that districts with a high professional level adopt nearly twice as many college-oriented innovations as do districts with a low professional level (13.5 vs. 7.8). In Table 8b, a similar pattern is found. Again, teachers propose nearly all innovations for terminal students students in districts with a high professional level, but only about half the innovations in districts with a low professional level (95% vs. 53%). Note, however, that the presence of highly professional teachers does not result in a greater number of adoptions for terminal students (5.5 per high professionalism district vs. 7.2 per low professionalism district). Administrators (superintendents and principals) in the district with a low professionalism level of instructional staff make up for the small number of terminal-oriented innovations proposed by teachers.

Although the Stanford study is by far the most comprehensive of the three studies, it appears that no specific data was collected on the level of teacher education. However, Schaffarzick noted (see point 4, p. 15)

TABLE 8

TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM AND WHERE INITIATED
(Daft and Becker, 1978, pp. 109-110, 13 Cook County Illinois High School Districts - 1968-1972 period)

	PROFESSIONALISM					
	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW	
	%	$(\bar{x})$*	%	$(\bar{x})$	%	$(\bar{x})$
WHERE INITIATED						
8a. For College-Oriented Innovations:						
Teachers	94	(12.8)	75	(7.5)	58	(4.6)
Administrators	6	(0.8)	5	(0.5)	21	(1.6)
Collaborations	0	(0.0)	20	(2.0)	21	(1.6)
TOTAL	100	(13.5)	100	(10.0)	100	(7.8)
Number of adoptions	N = 54		N = 40		N = 39	
8b. For Terminal-Oriented Innovations:						
Teachers	95	(5.3)	75	(4.5)	53	(3.8)
Administrators	5	(0.3)	17	(1.0)	33	(2.4)
Collaborations	0	(0.0)	8	(0.5)	14	(1.0)
TOTAL	100	(5.5)	100	(6.0)	100	(7.2)
Number of adoptions	N = 22		N = 24		N = 36	

* $\bar{x}$ = the average number of adoptions per district.

that more "professional" teachers tend to be more involved in curriculum decisions and in initiation of educational change. Teacher competence and motivation as well as administrator accommodation are cited as reasons for the finding.

The Far West study (Chorness, et al., p. 5) provides information on the level of education for all four positions covered in the survey. (Twenty percent of the teachers had M.A. or higher degrees, whereas 90 percent of those on the other three positions had M.A. or higher degrees.) However, no further information on the relation of degree level to other variables is provided. As part of the reanalysis, we cross tabulated degree level for teachers with teachers' perceptions of who was the primary originator for 16 innovations. We note that this is a far different measure than used by Daft and Becker. The unit of analysis in their study is the school district, and professionalism is defined as the percentage of all teachers in the district with M.A.s. In the current case, we are comparing perceptions of individual teachers with B.A.s or with M.A.s. The results, organized by the three types of innovations, are presented in Table 9.

The first thing to note in Table 9 is that there is very little difference between teachers with B.A. degrees and M.A. degrees in their perception of teachers as originators of innovations--overall or for any of the three types of innovations. The largest difference (31% vs. 38%) is for curriculum innovations, and this is not a statistically significant difference. However, Table 9 suggests that there are other differences between B.A.- and M.A.-level teachers on their perception of others' roles as originators. Larger percentages of B.A.-level teachers report school boards, superintendents, and principals as originators, while larger

TABLE 9

FAR WEST SURVEY (1968)
ORIGINATOR OF INNOVATIONS BY ROLE AS REPORTED BY B.A.-LEVEL AND M.A.-LEVEL TEACHERS

(San Francisco Bay Area Schools, 1968)

INFORMANT	SCHOOL BOARD		SUPT.		DISTRICT STAFF		PRINCIPAL		TEACHERS		COMMUNITY & STUDENTS	
TOTAL FOR ALL 16 INNOVATIONS												
B.A. Teachers	32	8%	49	13%	84	21%	71	18%	144	37%	11	3%
M.A. Teachers	0	0	7	7%	36	37%	12	12%	39	40%	4	4%
Total	32	7%	56	11%	120	25%	83	17%	183	37%	15	3%
THREE CURRICULUM INNOVATIONS												
B.A. Teachers	12	12%	19	20%	28	29%	7	7%	30	31%	1	1%
M.A. Teachers	0	0	2	[illegible]%	12	46%	2	8%	10	38%	0	0
Total	12	10%	21	17%	40	32%	9	7%	40	33%	1	1%
SIX TEACHING METHOD INNOVATIONS												
B.A. Teachers	9	7%	9	7%	34	27%	21	17%	49	40%	2	2%
M.A. Teachers	0	0	3	9%	12	34%	3	9%	15	43%	2	6%
Total	9	6%	12	8%	46	29%	24	15%	64	40%	4	3%
SEVEN ORGANIZATIONAL INNOVATIONS												
B.A. Teachers	11	6%	21	12%	22	13%	43	25%	65	38%	8	5%
M.A. Teachers	0	0	2	5%	12	32%	7	19%	14	38%	2	5%
Total	11	5%	23	11%	34	16%	50	24%	79	38%	10	5%

percentage of M.A.-level teachers report district staff members as the originators of innovations. Although the percentage patterns are different, this general pattern is found for all three types of innovations.*

However, these differences between B.A.- and M.A.-level teachers' perceptions of others' roles seem to be attributable to the different distribution of teachers with advanced degrees. For example, while 13 percent of grade school teachers in the Far West survey sample held M.A. degrees, 18 percent of junior high school teachers held M.A. degrees, and 43 percent of high school teachers held M.A.s. When considered in terms of size of school district, 31 percent of the teachers in the very largest districts (ADA over 11,150) held M.A.s while only 18 percent of the teachers in small and intermediate size districts held M.A. degrees. Finally, when considered in terms of wealth, 33 percent of the teachers in the wealthiest districts held M.A. degrees, while only 19 percent of the teachers in poor and intermediate wealth districts held M.A.s. It is thus likely that the differences in Table 9 reflect the combined effects of school level, district size, and district wealth. If this is the case, then the perhaps surprising thing is that there is so little difference in the percentages between M.A. and B.A. teachers in their identification of teachers as originators. The Far West

---

* A chi square analysis of the data for all 16 innovations produces a $X^2 = 19.6$, p. >.01. Examination of the adjusted residuals for cells indicates that the differences between B.A. and M.A. teachers' percentages for school boards and for district staff are the two major sources of significant differences between observed and expected frequencies. Chi square tests for the data for the three curriculum innovations and for the six teaching methods were not significant; however, the chi square test for data on the seven organizational innovations (deleting community and other data due to small expected cell frequencies) was significant ($x^2 = 11.3$, $p < .03$). In this instance, the adjusted residuals indicate that data for district staff is the major significant source of cell discrepancies.

data thus suggest that professionalism, as defined by Daft and Becker, probably varies by district size (see also Table 2), district wealth (see also Table 3), and school grade level (see also Table 7). Unfortunately, the Far West samples of teachers per district are too small to accurately estimate the "professionalism" of each district--so we have no direct way to corroborate the Daft and Becker findings with regard to teacher professionalism.

SUMMARY

Taken together, these studies provide substantial information on the role of teachers and others in school districts with respect to educational decision making and innovation. However, they also demonstrate that data of this sort can be profoundly affected by many variables (position of the informant, grade level of the school, size of the district, district wealth, professionalism of the staff, social organization of the school, type of decision area, type of innovation) that are often not controlled or reported. Moreover, all studies have failed to pinpoint exactly who among the teachers and the principals in a school or district are the major participants. So we are left with Schaffarzick's observation that the majority of teacher participation in curriculum decisions and initiation of educational innovations is probably due to the repeated involvement of a very small minority of teachers, as a counterpoint to the general finding that "teachers" are significant initiators of innovations and participants in decision making, at least with respect to the curriculm and instructional area of educational planning and management. However, even with respect to this point, the Far West survey data suggest that the great majority of all teachers personally perceive themselves as having at least an advisory role in many curriculum and instructional areas.

Both the Stanford study (see especially Meyer, et al., 1980) and the Far West survey demonstrate that there is only moderate consensus among persons in different positions at the same level or at different levels concerning many aspects of school operations, including the decision making and innovation process. However, we wonder how much of this lack of consensus within districts (or between studies) may be due to real differences--in perception,

in interpretation, but, most importantly, real differences in fact--because individuals are reporting different realities in terms of which decisions and which innovation they have in mind, which specific persons they are referring to, but also which schools or groups they are considering. The Stanford data (see especially Johnson, 1979) clearly demonstrate that teacher participation and influence in decision making in elementary schools increases substantially when teachers collaborate, that increases are noted with increasing intensity and extensity of collaboration, and are greatest in schools where teaming of staff is both extensive and intensive (Johnson, 1976, p. 30). It is likely that teachers and groups of teachers within schools vary in their levels of collaboration, and schools vary within districts. Moreover, the Far West data with respect to school grade level and the contrast of the Stanford data on elementary schools with the Daft and Becker data on high schools point to starkly different levels of teacher activity as originators of innovation, as one moves from elementary schools to junior high schools and then to senior high schools. All three studies seem to confirm, in various ways, important differences associated with the size of the district and the wealth of the district, as also influencing conditions affecting who participates in decisions and who originates innovations. Finally, the Daft and Becker study, the Far West study, and Schaffarzick all suggest that level of professionalism of the staff may significantly affect the levels of teacher vs. others' participation in decision making and the innovation origination processes in schools. Given these many factors, it is not surprising that there often appear to be inconsistencies and differences among studies, or the appearance of lack of consensus among informants within particular school systems.

Perhaps we should finally note that neither decision making nor innovation are such objective, well defined, one-point-in-time events as is sometimes implied. "Garbage can" models of decision making (Cohen, March, and Olsen, 1972; March and Olsen, 1976, Daft and Becker, 1977, pp. 164-169), conceptions of school organizations as loosely coupled systems (Weick, 1976, 1979; Meyer and Rowan, 1978) and in-depth studies of the innovation process in schools (Shipman, 1974; Sussman, 1977; Berman and McLaughlin, 1978, 1979; Berman, 1979) and other organizations (Bingham, 1975; Yin et al., 1976; Eveland, Rogers, and Klepper, 1977) all point to far more complex, dynamic, and evolving, ambiguous, multi-faceted, and fluid, multi-participant characterizations of decision making and innovation in schools and other public service organizations. These more recent images of the process of innovation, decision making, and implementation convey depths of complexity, ambiguity, and change over time, that are massively dissonant with the simpler, static conceptions of decision participation, and innovation origination and adoption that are implied in the questionnaire items and the data presentations of the circa 1968-1973 studies reviewed in this paper. Although the later references just cited do sometimes point to the importance of teachers' and others' participation (e.g., Berman and McLaughlin, 1978), and although we have rich sources of "micro-analysis" of decision making (e.g., Eggleston, 1979) and many case studies of educational implementation processes (e.g., Shipman, 1974; Wirt et al., 1975; Summers et al., 1975; Pascal et al., 1975; Sussman, 1977), there is still a broad gap between the rich, complex detail provided in specific case studies that are typically limited in their generalizeability and the far more limited, superficial, and static, but generalizeable results of larger survey studies.

REFERENCES

Berman, P. A New Perspective on Implementation Design: Adaptive Implementation. In Hood, P. D. (ed.), New Perspectives on Planning, Management, and Evaluation in School Improvement. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1979.

Berman, P. and McLaughlin, M. W. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. III: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations. Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1978.

Berman, P. and McLaughlin M. W. An Exploratory Study of School District Adaptation. Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1979.

Bingham, R. D. and McNaught, T. P. The Adoption of Innovation by Local Government. Milwaukee, WI: Office of Urban Research, Marquette University, 1975.

Chorness, M. H., Rittenhouse, C. H., and Heald, R. C. Decision Processes and Information Needs in Education: A Field Survey. Berkeley, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1968. ERIC ED 026 748

Cohen, E. G., Deal, T. E., Meyer, J. W., and Scott, W. R. Organization and Instruction in Elementary Schools: First Results, 1973 (Technical Report No. 50). Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, School of Education, Stanford University, 1973.

Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., and Olsen, J. P. A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 1-25, March 1972.

Daft. R. L. and Becker, S. W. The Innovative Organization: Innovation Adoption in School Organizations. New York, NY: Elsevier, 1978.

Eggleston, J. (ed.). Teacher Decision-making in the Classroom: A Collection of Papers. Boston, MA: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.

Eveland, J. D., Rogers, E. M., and Klepper, C. The Innovation Process in Public Organizations. Ann Arbor, MI: Department of Journalism, University of Michigan, 1977.

Fullan, M. The Role of the Human Agent Internal to School Districts in Knowledge Utilization (Working Paper for Knowledge Synthesis, Educational Dissemination Studies Program). San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1979.

Johnson, R. Teacner Collaboration, Principal Influence, and Decision Making in Elementary Schools (Technical Report No. 48). Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, School of Education Stanford University, 1976.

March, J. G. and Olsen, J. P. Ambiguity and Choice in Organizations. Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget, 1976.

Meyer, J. W. and Rowan, B. The Structure of Educational Organizations. In Meyer, M. W. (ed.), Environments and Organizations. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Meyer, J. W., Scott, W. R., Cole, S., and Intile, J. K. Instructional Dissensus and Institutional Consensus in Schools. In Meyer, M. W. (ed.), Environments and Organizations. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1978, pp. 233-263.

Pascal, A. H., Elmore, R. F., Endo, T. I., and McCluskey, L. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. III: The Process of Change, Appendix D, Innovations in Career Education. Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1975.

Schaffarzick, J. Teacher and Lay Participation in Local Curriculum Change Considerations. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA: April 19-23, 1976. ERIC ED 126 620

Shipman, M. Inside a Curriculum Project: A Case Study in the Process of Curriculum Change. London: Methuen, 1974.

Sumner, G. C., Endo, T. I., Greenwood, P. W., Hawkins, B. J., MaCluskey, L., Samulon, M., and Zellman, G. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. III: The Process of Change, Appendix C, Innovations in Bilingual Education. Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1975.

Sussman, L. Tales Out of School. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1977.

Weick, K. E. Overview of Ne Perspectives in Organizational Theory. In Hood, P. D. (ed.), New Perspectives on Planning, Management, and Evaluation in School Improvement. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1979.

Weick, K. E. Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 1-19, 1976.

Wirt, J. G., Endo, T. I., McCluskey, L., and Murphy, J. T. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. III: The Process of Change, Appendix B, Innovations in Reading. Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1975.

Yin, R., Heald, K. A., Vogel, M. E., Fleischauer, P. D., and Vladeck, B. C. A Review of Case Studies in Technological Innovations in State and Local Services. Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1976.